

Localization at threshold in noncommutative space

Pulak Ranjan Giri*

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta 700064, India

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

The ground state energy of a scale symmetric system usually does not possess any lower bound, thus making the system quantum mechanically unstable. Self-adjointness and renormalization techniques usually provide the system a scale and thus making the ground state bounded from below. We on the other hand use noncommutative quantum mechanics and exploit the noncommutative parameter Θ as a scale for a scale symmetric system. The resulting Hamiltonian for the system then allows an unusual bound state at the threshold of the energy, $E = 0$. Apart from the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ we also compute the other two generators of the $so(2, 1)$ algebra, the dilation $\hat{D}$ and the conformal generator $\hat{K}$ in the noncommutative space. The $so(2, 1)$ algebra is not closed in the noncommutative space, but the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ smoothly goes to the $so(2, 1)$ algebra restoring the conformal symmetry. We also discuss the system for large noncommutative parameter.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 02.40.Gh, 03.65.Ta

The study of physics in noncommutative spacetime [1, 2] or only in noncommutative space [3, 4, 5] has become an independent field of research work for a long time. It started with the work of Snyder [6, 7], where Electromagnetic theory is considered in noncommutative spacetime. It is a well known fact that the coordinates of a plane become noncommutative when the quantum mechanical system in a magnetic field (perpendicular to plane) background is confined in lowest Landau level. However non-commutativity was present in theoretical physics before the concept of noncommutativity in spacetime or in space coordinates was introduced. For example, the canonically conjugate operators like coordinate x^i and its conjugate momenta p^i are noncommutative $[x^i, p^i] = i\hbar$, which leads to the uncertainty principle $\Delta x^i \Delta p^i \geq \hbar/2$ in quantum mechanics. On the other hand although the different momentum components do commute, it is known that the components of a generalized momenta in the background magnetic field, $\mathbf{B} = (B^1, B^2, B^3)$, do not commute, $[P^i, P^j] = i\epsilon^{ijk} B^k$.

Noncommutativity and its effect is studied in diverse fields starting from Quantum Field Theory [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14], String theory [15, 16, 17, 18] to quantum mechanics [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42]. In quantum mechanical context several models are studied in noncommutative space. The list includes harmonic oscillator [43], Hydrogen atom problem [44, 45], Zeeman effect and Stark [44] effect. Even the effect of noncommutative space is studied for a general central potential and solutions are obtained in large noncommutative limit [3]. It is known that usually the inclusion of spacetime noncommutativity destroys the unitarity of a system but that can be restored by a different formulation of noncommutativity of Doplicher et al [46, 47]

The present letter is concerned with a scale invariant

system in non-commutative space. In particular we consider a particle on a plane (2D) with an inverse square potential [48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55]. The importance of the inverse square potential in theoretical physics can be understood from the huge research works carried out so far, which in some stage can be described by an inverse square potential. Its presence is investigated in detail in molecular physics [52], atomic physics [50, 52], black hole physics and mathematical physics. It shows that inverse square potential possesses bound state solution due to the scaling anomaly caused by quantization. Usually a length scale is introduced by a technique called self-adjoint extensions [56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64] or by renormalization [65].

In this article we consider that the space is noncommutative. This allows us to exploit the noncommutativity as a scale and then to study the system. The scale symmetry of the system is thus explicitly violated by the noncommutative parameter, Θ , dependent terms in the Taylor series expansion of the Hamiltonian. Considering inverse square potential in the non-commutative space results to a new problem, which falls under an interesting class of potentials $V_\mu = g/r^\mu$, $\mu > 2$ [66]. It is known that the system with a potential V_μ possesses bound state solutions with energy $E = 0$. According to our standard notion $E = 0$ serves as a border line between negative energy bound states and positive energy scattering states. But the fact that this notion is not always true was shown by J. Daboul and M. M. Nieto in [67], where they argued that for potentials which asymptotically goes to zero from above $V_\mu = 0$ line, may exhibit localized states at $E = 0$. See a comment also [68].

The article is organized in the following fashion: First, we consider the well known inverse square interaction on a plane and shown how it changes when the co-ordinates of the plane become non-commutative. Second, we deal with localization of the system we considered in previous discussion, at threshold of the particle energy, $E = 0$. Third, we discuss the system for large noncommutativity, i.e., Θ large, and then we conclude.

*Electronic address: pulakranjan.giri@saha.ac.in

First, we consider a quantum mechanical system on a plane with inverse square potential $V = \alpha \mathbf{r}^{-2}$, α is a constant parameter. Inverse square potential is important both in theoretical physics and experimental physics. It may arise in molecular physics, when the fermions are scattered by the vapor of polar molecules. It has application in atomic physics and black hole physics. From theoretical point of view this potential V carries interesting properties. For example, system with potential V possesses conformal symmetry, generated by three operators; Hamiltonian H , Dilatation generator D and conformal generator K . In $2D$ coordinate space the representation of the three generators are (unit used $2m = \hbar = 1$)

$$H = \mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha \mathbf{r}^{-2}, \quad (1)$$

$$D = Ht - (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r})/4, \quad (2)$$

$$K = Ht^2 - (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r})t/2 + \mathbf{r}^2/4, \quad (3)$$

which is known to form the $so(2,1)$ algebra [69]

$$[D, H] = -iH, \quad [D, K] = iK, \quad [H, K] = 2iD. \quad (4)$$

It is to be noted that due to the scale symmetry of the system, described by the Hamiltonian H , there is no lower bound for the bound state of the system. This system is thus usually unstable. But it is known that due to scaling anomaly the system may have a finite bound state thus making the system physically meaningful from the bound state point of view. The usual technique for providing the system a scale are self-adjoint extension and re-normalization. We however study the system in noncommutative space and exploit the scale Θ involved in the noncommutative space $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2)$. The standard commutator algebra

$$[x_i, x_j] = 0, \quad [p_i, p_j] = 0, \quad [x_i, p_j] = i\delta_{ij}, \quad (5)$$

defined over the phase space is modified due to the noncommutative scale Θ as

$$[\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{x}_j] = 2i\epsilon_{ij}\Theta, \quad [\widehat{p}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = 0 \quad [\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{p}_j] = i\delta_{ij}, \quad (6)$$

where $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$, $\epsilon_{11} = \epsilon_{22} = 0$. Assuming that $\lim_{\Theta \rightarrow 0} [\widehat{x}_i, \widehat{x}_j] \rightarrow [x_i, x_j]$ is defined, one can get a realization of the noncommutative phase space coordinates $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2, \widehat{p}_1, \widehat{p}_2)$ in terms of standard coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{x}_1 &= x_1 - \Theta p_2, & \widehat{x}_2 &= x_2 + \Theta p_1 \\ \widehat{p}_1 &= p_1, & \widehat{p}_2 &= p_2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The $so(2,1)$ generators are supposed to get modified, where all coordinates and momentum in Eqs. (1)-(3) will be replaced by corresponding noncommutative counterpart $(\widehat{x}_1, \widehat{x}_2, \widehat{p}_1, \widehat{p}_2)$. Note that the introduction of noncommutative coordinates remove the singularity of the observables. Keeping up to first order term in Θ in the Taylor series expansion the generators become [70]

$$\widehat{H} = H + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z \quad (8)$$

$$\widehat{D} = D + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z t \quad (9)$$

$$\widehat{K} = K + \Theta (2\alpha t^2 r^{-4} - 1/2) L_z \quad (10)$$

Now the new commutators, formed by the the generators by keeping only first order in Θ terms,

$$[\widehat{D}, \widehat{H}] = -i\widehat{H} - \Theta 2i\alpha r^{-4} L_z, \quad (11)$$

$$[\widehat{D}, \widehat{K}] = i\widehat{K} + \Theta (2i\alpha t^2 r^{-4} + i/2) L_z, \quad (12)$$

$$[\widehat{K}, \widehat{H}] = -2i\widehat{D} - \Theta 4i\alpha t r^{-4} L_z, \quad (13)$$

are not closed. Note that the scale symmetry is explicitly broken by the term $\Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z$ in Eq. (8). Note that the commutative limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ restores the $so(2,1)$ algebra, namely Eqs. (11) - (13) reduce to Eq. (4). In the next section we discuss the bound state property of the system at threshold.

Second, we now discuss the system described by the Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}$. Since we are interested in the localization properties at the threshold $E = 0$, the Schrödinger eigenvalue equation becomes

$$(\mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha \mathbf{r}^{-2} + \Theta 2\alpha r^{-4} L_z) \psi = 0 \quad (14)$$

where ψ is a simultaneous eigenstate of $\widehat{H}$ and L_z , with eigenvalues 0 and m respectively. The $so(2)$ symmetry (rotation about z axis) is intact even in noncommutative space. Eq. (14) is separable in polar coordinates (r, ϕ) . The angular eigenfunction is $\Phi = \exp(im\phi)$, with eigenvalue equation $L_z \Phi = m\Phi$. The ansatz $\psi = R(r)\Phi$ with a further similarity transformation $R(r) = \chi(r)/\sqrt{r}$ reduces Eq. (14) to a $1D$ equation

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{4m^2 + 4\alpha - 1}{4r^2} + \frac{2\Theta\alpha m}{r^4} \right) \chi(r) = 0 \quad (15)$$

The localized solution of (15) apart from normalization constant is

$$R(r) = J_{\sqrt{m^2 + \alpha}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{-2\Theta\alpha m}}{r} \right), \quad (16)$$

where the constraint $\sqrt{m^2 + \alpha} > 1$ [66] needs to be satisfied in order the solution to be normalizable, which is found from the normalization constant.

Third, the solution for generic central potential $V(r)$ for large noncommutativity, i.e., Θ large, is solved in [3]. Our inverse square potential is a special case of [3] for Θ large, where now $V(r) = \alpha r^{-2}$. Now the Hamiltonian H in noncommutative space becomes

$$\widehat{H} = \mathbf{p}^2 + \alpha (\Theta^2 \mathbf{p}^2 + r^2 - 2\Theta L_z)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

In order to solve the system with Hamiltonian (17), it is useful to first solve the system with Hamiltonian $H_\Theta = \Theta^2 \mathbf{p}^2 + r^2 - 2\Theta L_z$ in Schwinger representation. The annihilation operators [43]

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{a}_+ &= (x_1 - ix_2) + \Theta(ip_1 + p_2), \\ \widehat{a}_- &= (ix_1 - x_2) - \Theta(p_1 + ip_2), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

satisfy the commutation relation

$$[\widehat{a}_+, \widehat{a}_+^\dagger] = [\widehat{a}_-, \widehat{a}_-^\dagger] = 4\Theta, \quad (19)$$

with all the other commutations among the creation and annihilation operators being zero. In this representation the number operators

$$\widehat{n}_+ = \widehat{a}_+^\dagger \widehat{a}_+, \quad \widehat{n}_- = \widehat{a}_-^\dagger \widehat{a}_-, \quad (20)$$

satisfy the eigenvalue equation

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{n}_+ |n_+, n_-\rangle &= n_+ |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad n_+ = 0, 4\Theta, 8\Theta, 12\Theta, \dots \\ \widehat{n}_- |n_+, n_-\rangle &= n_- |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad n_- = 0, 4\Theta, 8\Theta, 12\Theta, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The Hamiltonian H_Θ in the representation $|n_+, n_-\rangle$,

$$H_\Theta = \widehat{n}_- + 2\Theta \quad (22)$$

satisfy the eigenvalue equation

$$H_\Theta |n_+, n_-\rangle = E_\Theta |n_+, n_-\rangle, \quad (23)$$

with $E_\Theta = n_- + 2\Theta$. The eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian

$\widehat{H}$ in $|n_+, n_-\rangle$ basis is

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \langle n_+, n_- | \mathbf{p}^2 | n_+, n_- \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{n_- + 2\Theta} \\ &= \frac{n_+ + n_- + 4\Theta}{4\Theta^2} + \frac{\alpha}{n_- + 2\Theta} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Note that the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ can not be taken in (24). It should be noted that scale symmetry is broken for large non-commutativity also.

Finally, we considered particle interacting with inverse square potential in non-commutative space. The non-commutative correction (Θ small) to the Hamiltonian leads to a potential $2\Theta\alpha r^{-4}L_z$, which together with the inverse square potential αr^{-2} and the potential $-(1/4)r^{-2}$ coming from the kinetic term in $2D$ are capable of binding particle with energy $E = 0$. We show that the $so(2,1)$ algebra in commutative space, which is responsible for conformal symmetry for such system is no longer closed in non-commutative space. But the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ smoothly goes to the $so(2,1)$ algebra. For large Θ the system is solved but this time the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$ can not be taken.

-
- [1] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 977 (2001).
 - [2] X. Calmet and M. Selvaggi, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 037901 (2006).
 - [3] J. Gamboa, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 067901 (2001).
 - [4] J. Gamboa, F. Mendez, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A17**, 2555 (2002).
 - [5] B. Muthukumar and P. Mitra, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 027701 (2002).
 - [6] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 38 (1947).
 - [7] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **72**, 68 (1947).
 - [8] J. madore, S. Schraml, P. Schupp and J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C16**, 161 (2000).
 - [9] X. Calmet, B. Jurco, P. Schupp, J. Wess and M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C23**, 363 (2002).
 - [10] R. Banerjee, S. Ghosh and T. Shreecharan, arXiv:0712.3631v1 [hep-th].
 - [11] A.P. Balachandran, T.R. Govindarajan and B. Ydri, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A15**, 1279 (2000).
 - [12] H. Falomir, J. Gamboa, J. Lopez-Sarrion, F. Mendez and A.J. da Silva, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 047701 (2006).
 - [13] J. Gamboa and J. Lopez-Sarrion, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 067702 (2005).
 - [14] J. M. Carmona, J. L. Cortes, J. Gamboa and F. Mendez, JHEP **0303**, 058 (2003).
 - [15] N. Seiberg, E. Witten, JHEP **9909**, 032 (1999).
 - [16] M. R. Douglas and C. M. Hull, JHEP **9802**, 008 (1998).
 - [17] C. Chu and P. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B550**, 151 (1999).
 - [18] C. Chu and P. Ho, Nucl. Phys. **B568**, 447 (2000).
 - [19] P. A. Horvathy and M. S. Plyuschay, JHEP **0206**, 033 (2002).
 - [20] P. A. Horvathy, Ann. Phys. **299**, 128 (2002).
 - [21] P. A. Horvathy and M. S. Plyuschay, Phys. Lett. **B595**, 547 (2004).
 - [22] C. Duval and P. A. Horvathy, Phys. Lett. **B 479**, 284 (2000).
 - [23] P. A. Horvathy, L. Martina and P. Stichel, Phys. Lett. **B 564**, 149 (2003).
 - [24] B. Dragovich and Z. Rakic, hep-th/0602245.
 - [25] F. Delduc, Q. Duret, F. Gieres and Matthieu Lefrancois, arXiv:0710.2239v1 [quant-ph].
 - [26] V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 267 (2001).
 - [27] L. Jonke and S. Meljanak, Eur. Phys. J. **C29**, 433 (2003).
 - [28] R. Banerjee, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 631 (2002).
 - [29] R. Banerjee, Eur. Phys. J. **C47**, 541 (2006).
 - [30] R. Banerjee and K. Kumar, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 045008 (2007).
 - [31] J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, F. Mendez and J. C. Rojas, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A16**, 2075 (2001).
 - [32] M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, P. Presnajder, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Nucl. Phys. **B611**, 383 (2001).
 - [33] S. bellucci, A. Nersessian and C. Sochichiu, Phys. Lett. **B522**, 345 (2001).
 - [34] S. bellucci and A. Nersessian, Phys. Lett. **B542**, 295 (2002).
 - [35] G. D. Barbosa and N. Pinto-Neto, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 065014 (2004).
 - [36] C. Duval and P. A. Horvathy, J. Phys. **A34**, 10097 (2001).
 - [37] D. Karabali, V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Nucl. Phys. **B627**, 565 (2002).
 - [38] I. Dadić, L. Jonke and S. Meljanac, Acta Phys. Slov. **55**, 149 (2005).
 - [39] A. Jellal, E. H. El Kinani and M. Schreiber, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A20**, 1515 (2005).
 - [40] O. F. Dayi and A. Jellal, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4592 (2002);

- Erratum-ibid **45**, 827 (2004).
- [41] O. F. Dayi and A. Jellal, Phys. Lett. **A287**, 349 (2001).
 - [42] A. Jellal, J. Phys. **A34**, 10159 (2001).
 - [43] A. Kijanka and P. Kosinski, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 127702 (2004).
 - [44] S. bellucci and A. Yeranyan, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 085010 (2005).
 - [45] M. Chaichian, M. M. Shekh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2716 (2001).
 - [46] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, J. E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. **172**, 187 (1995).
 - [47] D. Bahna, S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and G. Piacitelli, Phys. Lett. **B533**, 178 (2002).
 - [48] P. R. Giri, Phys. Rev. **A76**, 012114 (2007).
 - [49] P. R. Giri, arXiv:0704.1725v2 [hep-th].
 - [50] P. R. Giri, Int. J. Theor. Phys. (Online).
 - [51] P. R. Giri, K. S. Gupta, S. Meljanac and A. Samsarov, hep-th/0703121, (Accepted in Phys. Lett. A).
 - [52] P. R. Giri, arXiv:0708.2969v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci].
 - [53] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti and C. A. G. Canal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 220402 (2001).
 - [54] H. E. Camblong, C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 125013 (2003).
 - [55] D. Bouaziz and M. Bawin, Phys. Rev. **A76**, 032112 (2007).
 - [56] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness* (New York :Academic, 1975).
 - [57] B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and K. S. Gupta, Nucl. Phys. **B659**, 437 (2003).
 - [58] B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. **A311**, 87 (2003).
 - [59] K. S. Gupta, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A18**, 2355 (2003).
 - [60] B. Basu-Mallick and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. **A292**, 36 (2001).
 - [61] D. Birmingham, K. S. Gupta and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B505**, 191 (2001);
 - [62] K. S. Gupta and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. **B526**, 121 (2002).
 - [63] S. Meljanac, A. Samsarov, B. Basu-Mallick and K. S. Gupta, Eur. Phys. J. **C49**, 875 (2007).
 - [64] L. Feher, I. Tsutsui, T. Fulop, Nucl.Phys. **B715**, 713 (2005).
 - [65] K. S. Gupta and S. G. Rajeev, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 5940 (1993).
 - [66] A. J. Makowski and K. J. Gorska, Phys. Lett. **A362**, 26 (2007).
 - [67] J. Daboul and M. M. Nieto, Phys. Lett. **A190**, 357 (1994).
 - [68] S. A. Hojman and D. Nunez, Phys. Lett. **A209**, 385 (1995).
 - [69] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini and G. Furlan, Nuovo Cimento **34A**, 569 (1976).
 - [70] S. bellucci and A. Yeranyan, Phys. Lett. **B609**, 418 (2005).